JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) 1 United States Attorney 2 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) 3 Chief, Criminal Division OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104) 4 Assistant United States Attorneys 5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 RICHARD W. WIEKING San Francisco, California 94102 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 Telephone: (415) 436-7241 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 7 owen.martikan@usdoj.gov 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 12 13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CR 10-0245 JSW 14 Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] 15 ORDER EXCLUDING TIME 16 v. KENNETH MARTIN KYLE, 17 18 Defendant. 19 20 21 On April 5, 2010, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for identification of counsel and initial appearance on the indictment. The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that 22 time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from April 5, 2010, through 23 24 April 29, 2010, for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of 25 defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 26 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a 27 28 STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR 10-0245 JSW

continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 1 2 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). 3 SO STIPULATED: 4 5 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney б /s/7 DATED: April 28, 2010 OWEN P. MARTIKAN 8 Assistant United States Attorney 9 /s/DATED: April 28, 2010 10 DAVID MICHAEL BIGELEISEN 11 Attorney for Kenneth Martin Kyle 12 13 |PROPOSED| ORDER 14 As the Court found on April 5, 2010, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of 15 time from April 5, 2010, through April 29, 2010, is warranted because the ends of justice served 16 by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(7)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny 17 defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the 18 exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. 19 20 $\S3161(h)(7)(B)(iv)$. 21 SO ORDERED. 22 23 DATED 28 April 10 24 25 United States Magistrate Judge 26 27 28

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR 10-0245 JSW